THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY

–

WRIT PETITION NO : 18270 of 2005

–

Dated:22.09.2005

Between:

G.Vijaya Reddy, W/o.G.Sreenivasa Reddy,
R/o.Flat No.201, Chakravarthi Towers 1-11-112/3/1, Shamalal

Buildings, Begumpet, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

The Superintendent of Police, Kurnool district, Kurnool, and others.

.....RESPONDENTS

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed questioning the interference of respondents 1 to 4 in the civil disputes between the petitioner and respondents 5 to 7.

It is the case of the petitioner that she is one of the plaintiffs in the suit in O.S.No.11 of 2005 on the file of the District Judge, Kurnool, and respondents 5 and 6 herein are also party defendants in the suit. It is her case that after filing of the suit, at the instance of respondents 5 to 7, respondents 1 to 4 are interfering and insisting for withdrawal of the suits. In that context their interference is questioned in this writ petition.

A counter affidavit is filed by the first respondent, Superintendent of Police, Kurnool District, stating that there are *inter se* civil disputes between the petitioner and the private respondents. But, however they denied their interference or any insistence on the petitioner for withdrawal of the suit filed by her. In paragraph No.7 of the counter affidavit filed by the first respondent it is stated as follows:

> "7. I respectfully submit that my enquiry clearly shows that there is no interference of the respondents 3 and 4 in the civil disputes of the petitioner and they did not threaten her to withdraw the suits at any point of time. I humbly submit that this respondent did not interfere with the disputes pending between the petitioner and the unofficial respondents nor did I instruct the respondents 3 and 4 or any one to see that the suits are withdrawn. The other allegations made in the affidavit against the official respondents are false, baseless and hence the same are denied."

In view of the specific denial of the respondents basing on record, and the stand taken by the respondents in counter affidavit, I dispose of the writ petition. But, however, it is observed that any such interference will be viewed very seriously afterwards. It is also open for the petitioner to approach this Court again, if there is any such interference.

Subject to the above observations, this writ petition is disposed of. No order as

to costs.

_____

(R.SUBHASH REDDY, J)

22.09.2005

vs